



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ley's imagination it is the autumn leaves that are "driven like ghosts" from the unseen presence of the wind.

Finally I note that towards Swinburne both Rhys and Schelling are more just than Reed, who overemphasizes the poet's lack of human sympathy. To this too-oft repeated assertion *The Pilgrims*, which is the very gospel of "social service," should be a complete reply.

In sum, the value of Rhys's book, despite occasional passages of sympathetic, if impressionistic, criticism, is slight; Schelling has made a good hand-book, a compendious satchel-guide to song; Reed's is a work of both suggestiveness and charm. In certain moods the student may well use his book; he will discard all such works when, approaching poetry in another mood, he hears through the magic casement the horns of elf-land blow.

SAMUEL C. CHEW, JR.

The Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.

Das schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte von HERMANN COLLITZ. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press), 1912. 8vo., xvi + 256 pp. (*Hesperia*. Schriften zur germanischen Philologie. Nr. 1.)

The current explanation of the so-called 'weak' preterit is based on theories advanced nearly a century ago by two well-known scholars, Franz Bopp and Jacob Grimm. In their opinion the dental of the weak preterit is a remnant of the preterit of the verb *to do*. A form *I said* is supposed not only to mean 'I did say,' but actually to contain in its *d* the preterit *I did*, so as to be the equivalent of *say + did* = Early Germanic **sag + dida*.

For half a century this view remained unchallenged. In 1868, however, Wilhelm Scherer attempted to substitute the theory of a close relationship of the weak preterit with the Greek passiv aorist in *-θην* and the Latin imperfect in *-bam*. These various tenses, in his opinion, are based on a composition of verbal roots with the

simple (or 'second') aorist of the root *dhē-* (i. e., the Germanic verb *do*). Scherer's explanation of the weak preterit was followed a few years later by another theory, much more revolutionary in character, in W. Begemann's monograph: *Das schwache Präteritum der Germanischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1873). According to Begemann the weak preterit is not a compound tense, embodying two verbal roots, but a simple tense, ending in a dental consonant. He observed, moreover, that the dental suffix of the weak preterit is identical in form with that of the Indo-European *to-participle*, and accordingly he ventured to explain the weak preterit as an offshoot of this participle.

Whilst to his contemporaries Begemann's theory seemed altogether improbable, subsequent investigators (e. g., E. Windisch, H. Möller, and others) took a more favorable attitude toward his views, or at least toward some of his views. For, obviously, in trying to solve the problem of the weak preterit we have to distinguish between two different questions: (1) that of the nature of the dental of the weak preterit,—chiefly a question of historical phonetics (*Lautgeschichte*); (2) that of the origin of the weak preterit, or in other words, of its historical connection with the I.-Eur. tense-system. This is rather a morphological question, although phonetics enters into it in so far as the *Auslautgesetze* must be carefully considered.

As regards both these questions, the issue is not entirely between Grimm, Scherer, and Begemann, because certain new theories and modifications of the former theories were advanced at a more recent date. The problem in any case is rather complicated, and both for this reason and on account of the fact that the views of modern investigators differ as much as those of earlier scholars, there seemed to be an urgent need for a review of the whole question and for an attempt to reconcile the conflicting conceptions of this peculiar Germanic tense.

The subject has been divided into six chapters.

Chap. I serves as an introduction, reviewing

in chronological order the various theories as to the origin of the weak preterit and the nature of its dental.

Chap. II contains a list of about 50 verbs in which the dental suffix of the weak preterit is connected with the verbal root without the aid of an intermediate vowel. This list includes, in other words, (1) weak preterits found outside of the three 'weak' or derivative conjugations; *e. g.*, the preterits of the so-called 'preterit-present' verbs (like Goth. *wait*, pret. *wissa* or *kann*, pret. *kunpa*); and (2) irregular preterits of weak verbs (like Goth. *þagkjan*, prt. *þakta*, or Westgerm. *haban*, prt. *habda*). Such forms are more important for the theory of the weak preterit than the regular preterits of the three weak conjugations, because here (in the irregular preterits) the dental of the preterit is found in various characteristic and ancient forms.

In Chap. III (on the dental of the weak preterit) stress is laid on the fact that the dental of the weak preterit always agrees not only—as recognized by Begemann—with that of the I.-Eur. *-to*-participle but also with that of the I.-Eur. *-ti*-abstracts. Obviously then the dental of the weak preterit originated from I.-Eur. *t*. As to the difficulty apparently presented by preterits like *lagða* 'laid', *sagða* 'said', *habða* 'had', these forms were many years ago explained by Kluge, who compared the groups *-gd-* and *-bd-* with Skr. *-gdh-* resulting from *gh+t* (*e. g.*, *dagdha*—*dagh+ta-*) and *bdh* from *bh+t* (*e. g.*, *labdha* 'seized' **labh+ta-*). Kluge's rule, however, must be supplemented by a second one, to the effect, that in 'Grassmann's roots'—*i. e.*, verbal stems beginning with and ending in an I.-Eur. aspirate (or in other words: in a Germanic media)—the aspiration is regularly lost before the suffixal *t*, *e. g.*, A. S. *boh-te* = Engl. *bought*, from I.-Eur. *bhugh-* or A. S. *gif-t* = Engl. *gift*, from I.-Eur. *ghebh-*.

There is only one weak preterit the dental of which cannot be derived from I.-Eur. *t*, viz., Westgermanic **deda* = O. S. *deda*, A. S. *dyde*, O. H. G. *teta*. This preterit, however, forms a class by itself in so far as the final syllable *-da* is not, strictly speaking, a grammatical ter-

mination, but contains the initial radical consonant (= I.-Eur. *dh*) with the ending *-a*, while the first *d* belongs to the reduplication-syllable. This form then is entirely to be separated from preterits like Goth. *munda*, *nasida*, etc.

In Chap. IV the terminations of the weak pret. are taken up. They are divided into two groups, viz.: (1) Middle endings (identical with the corresponding endings of the Gothic present passiv). This group consists of the 1 and 3 sing. ind.; (2) active endings (agreeing with the corresponding endings of the strong preterit). Here belong the 2 sing. ind., the plur. ind. and the optativ.

Many years ago, in an article published in the *Amer. Journal of Philology*, vol. IX, p. 42 ff., I first called attention to the identity of the endings of the 1 and 3 sing. ind. of the weak preterit with those of the corresponding passiv forms, and I identified—on the basis of this comparison—the 1 and 3 pers. sing. of the weak preterit with the corresponding forms of the I.-Eur. perfect middle. This suggestion was so much in contrast with the current views of the origin of the weak preterit that the majority of Germanic philologists hesitated to accept it, although several well-known scholars (*e. g.*, G. Körting, *Encyklopädie u. Methodologie der engl. Philologie*, Heilbronn, 1888, p. 20; K. F. Johansson, "Zur Flexion des schw. Prät. im Gotischen," *K.Z.* 30, p. 547 ff.; V. Henry, *Grammaire comparée de l'Anglais et de l'Allemand*, Paris, 1893, p. 327—*A short comparative grammar of English and German*, London, 1894, p. 317) gave expression to their approval. I trust that the more detailed exposition of this theory in the present monograph may convince others that this explanation is merely the natural conclusion drawn from indisputable facts, and meets with no serious objections.

The case is different with those endings of the weak preterit that agree with the corresponding endings of the strong preterit. To be sure, I suggested (in my paper referred to above) that these endings might have taken the place of former middle endings, and K. F. Johansson (in his article cited above) called

attention to certain peculiarities in the formation of the weak preterit that appear to indicate a connection of the Gothic dual forms of the weak preterit with the dual forms of the Sanskrit perfect middle. Johansson's arguments seemed convincing to me, and I have represented the matter in my monograph on the weak preterit in accordance with his views. This whole line of argument, however, rests on the presupposition that the weak preterit represents only a single I.-Eur. tense, and it must be admitted that this assumption is by no means certain. If, *e. g.*, the Latin perfect has resulted from a mixture of certain forms of the old perfect act. and perfect middle with others of the *s*-aorist act., and if the Celtic *t*-preterit is the result of a combination of the I.-Eur. 3 sing. pret. pass. with the 3 sing. of the simple aorist act.,¹ there is no reason why the Germanic weak preterit should not be considered as the outcome of both the I.-Eur. perfect middle and, *e. g.*, certain types of the I.-Eur. simple aorist. In my present opinion the latter theory is the more probable one. But I must be satisfied here with merely stating the fact that I have meanwhile changed my view as to this question. I expect soon to find time to discuss the problem again in a separate article.

Chap. V treats of the stem formation and the accent of the weak preterit. The stem agrees with that of the dual and plural forms of the strong preterit, as is seen most clearly in the tenses of the preterit-present verbs. In view of the fact that in Sanskrit the same relation exists between the stems of the dual and plural of the perfect act. and the stem of the perfect middle, this state of affairs supports the probability of a connection of the weak preterit with the I.-Eur. perfect middle.

So far as the original accent of the weak preterit can be traced by the application of Grimm's and Verner's laws, the accent was found sometimes (*e. g.*, in *kunþa*) on the stem syllable, but more frequently (*e. g.*, in *munda*, *wilda*) on the ending. This again agrees with what

we know of the accent of the I.-Eur. perfect middle.

Chap. VI is an appendix, commenting on the Latin perfect and the Greek passiv aorist. The ending of the 1 pers. sing. ind. of the Latin perfect is now generally acknowledged to belong to the I.-Eur. perfect middle. Hence, if we are right in claiming for the weak preterit a connection with the 3 pers. sing. of the I.-Eur. perfect middle, we may expect to find a close similarity between the Latin and the Germanic tense. This expectation is borne out by actual evidence in instances like Goth. *iddja* for **iia* = Lat. *ii*, Westgerm. *de-d-a* formed like Lat. *de-d-i*, and others. It must be remembered, however, that the Latin perfect is a mixture, so far as the stem is concerned, of active and middle forms, and that the similarity with the weak preterit, therefore, is restricted to forms of the latter type.

The Greek passiv aorist in *-θην* undoubtedly resembles the weak preterit in its general appearance and therefore claims our interest even if we do not assume (with Scherer and others) an historical connection between the two tenses. Unfortunately the origin of the passiv aorist in *-θην* is as much a matter of dispute as that of the weak preterit. The theory more generally favored at present is that of Jacob Wackernagel (*K.Z.* 30, 302 ff.), who regards the aorist in *-θην* as an offshoot of the aorist middle. While agreeing with Wackernagel as to the main issue, I have suggested two modifications in his theory in assuming (1) that the aorist in *-θην* is connected, not with both the *s*-aorist and the simple aorist middle, but only with the athematic form of the *s*-aorist; (2) that the dental of the *θην*-aorist is not connected with the Sanskrit ending *-thās* of the 2 sing. ind. middle in secondary tenses, but has developed from the initial dental of various endings of the aorist middle (*e. g.*, the 2 and 3 pers. dual and the 2 pers. plur.). These differences in opinion involve a different attitude as to the question of relationship between the passiv aorist and the weak preterit. While Wackernagel (like Scherer, though in a different manner) would connect these two tenses, there is in my opinion no

¹ Cp. H. Pedersen, *Vergl. Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1913, II, 377 f.

genetic connection but simply a similar historical process, namely, that of the evolution of a tense characterized by dental endings.

Pp. 233-240 contain a list of additions and corrections. While this list might be considerably extended, I shall confine myself here to a few additional corrections.

Misprints or errors are, *e. g.*, p. 56, note 1, *formuonstun* instead of *farmuonstun*; p. 75, l. 15 from below and p. 253, *hyht* f. instead of *hyht* m.; p. 95, l. 1, *ō*-Flexion instead of *ē*-Flexion; p. 124, l. 13 from below, *nakkā-* instead of *nakhā-*; p. 164, l. 11 from below, *Mittelniederländischen* instead of *Mittelniederdeutschen*; p. 198, l. 4 from below, **mazdā* instead of **mazdhā*; p. 215, l. 19, *λεκ* instead of *λεχ*. Lines 15-13 from below on p. 181 should read: "Zwar fehlt bei *ga-kunþ(i)-s* leider im Altindischen und Griechischen ein genau entsprechendes Substantiv, denn griech. *γνώσις* lässt sich dem gotischen Worte nicht unmittelbar zur Seite stellen."—An erroneous statement made on p. x, note 2, with regard to M. D. Learned's dissertation *The Pennsylvania German Dialect* (Baltimore, 1888) has been corrected by Professor Learned in the *German American Annals*, 1912, p. 260 f.

While I am not aware of any serious omissions as to the main theme of this monograph, I find that here and there additional references would have been in place with regard to certain etymologies and other matters of detail; *e. g.*, on p. 40, nr. 20, under Goth. *ga-mōt* (= Engl. *I must*) and *ga-mōtjan* (= Engl. *to meet*) I might have referred to Schade, *Altdtsch. Wörterbuch* s. v. *muozan* and R. Meringer, *I.F.* 18, p. 211 ff. (cp. also F. A. Wood, *Mod. Philology*, XI, 319 ff.).—In quoting p. 237 ff. various articles concerned with 'haplology' I should have included, *e. g.*, Prof. Jespersen's important papers in the *Nord. tidsskrift for filol. og pædag.*, Ny række vii (1886), 216 (= Techmer's *Zeitschrift* III, 195) and *ib.* IX (1890), 323. Cp. also the same author's remarks on this phenomenon in his book *Progress in language* (Lond., 1894), p. 343, and his *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, übs. v. Davidsen (Leipzig, 1904), p. 173. My intention, however, was not to compile an exhaustive bib-

liography. No reference is therefore found to Prof. Brugmann's discussion in his treatise *Das Wesen der lautlichen Dissimilation* (Leipzig, 1909), p. 6 ff. (esp. p. 14 f.), and to many other valuable contributions toward the study of this interesting subject.

It remains to be said that this study of the weak preterit forms the first number of a collection of monographs written by American scholars in the field of Germanic Philology, the latter term taken in its broadest sense, *i. e.*, not confining 'philology' to linguistic subjects, but using the term rather in the meaning of the German *Philologie*. This publication is not restricted to investigations carried on at any single university, but counts on the liberal support of American philologists generally.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

RECENT FLAUBERT LITERATURE

La Jeunesse de Flaubert, par E. MAYNIAL. Paris, Mercure de France, 1913. 346 pp.

L'Esthétique de Gustave Flaubert, par E. L. FERRÈRE. Paris, Conard, 1913. XII + 322 pp.

La Jeunesse de Flaubert, a collection of essays of varying length and interest, is not, as the title might suggest, primarily biographical; it is rather a group of studies in which Mr. Maynial desires to point out how large a part Flaubert's youthful surroundings and emotions played in his productions: in *Madame Bovary*, in *St. Antoine*, even in *Bouvard et Pécuchet*. He would doubtless allege this purpose in justification of his title, but if it be remarked that by far the longest study is devoted to Flaubert's journey in the East, made when he was twenty-eight, and that the last two sections—on the *Dictionnaire des Idées Reçues* and Flaubert's friendship with Maupassant—have only the most meager connection with his youth, it becomes clear that the book is largely a collec-